

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application and stand rejected by the examiner. Claims 1 and 30-32 are independent claims. Assignee traverses the rejections.

Specification

The office action objected to the disclosure because of certain informalities. Based on the recommendations in the office action, the assignee has corrected the specification and respectfully requests that the instant objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-15, 18, 20, 23, and 29 stand rejected in the office action under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims are amended herein to address the § 112 rejections.

With respect to claim 3, the office action commented that the claim appears to recite sending the seed value, originally sent by the remote device to the authentication system, from the authentication system back to the remote device. Assignee respectfully disagrees. Claim 3 recites that the authentication information store includes a seed store configured to store a plurality of seeds, and that the authentication system is configured to perform a set of operations, such as receiving a seed request from the remote device and to return a retrieved seed to the remote device if the calculated access code matches the received code. Accordingly the remote device in claim 3 is only providing the request for a seed, and in response to the request, the authentication system is sending the seed to the remote device.

With these amendments and remarks, assignee respectfully submits that the instant rejections have been traversed and the claims should be allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Claims 1-19, 24-29, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,161,185 issued to Guthrie et al. Claims 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guthrie in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,353 issued to Hashiguchi. Claims 30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Guthrie. These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for distributing authentication information to users of remote devices. Claim 1 recites in combination with its other limitations that an authentication information store stores authentication information for a plurality of users, and that the authentication system retrieves the authentication information for one of the plurality of users from the authentication information store. The retrieved authentication information is provided to the remote device.

The office action rejects claim 1 based upon Guthrie. On page 6, the office action equates the users' authentication information (of claim 1) with tables of a user account database that includes account IDs (as disclosed in Guthrie at column 5, lines 35-42). The office action acknowledges that Guthrie does not disclose that the user account table is provided to a remote device. The office action then maintains that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to send the authentication information [(i.e., user account table)] back to the remote device."

Assignee respectfully disagrees. The Guthrie reference actually teaches away from the sending of such sensitive user information from a server to a remote device. Guthrie discloses that server-side sensitive authentication data in the user account table (e.g., a user's authentication password) is "never transmitted over the network where it could be exposed or compromised." (See Guthrie at column 4, lines 25-28). Figure 4 of Guthrie makes this clear that such data is never transmitted from the server over the network. In fact, only two pieces of information are passed from the server to the remote device: the challenge and the information about whether an authentication succeeded or failed. Neither of these pieces of information is stored in the user account database, though. Accordingly sending the information contained in the user account table (which the office action mentions and equates with the authentication information recited in claim 1) over a network would violate the teachings of Guthrie. This is in stark contrast to claim 1, which recites retrieving authentication information from a store and sending it to the remote device.

As discussed above, the office action equates the users' authentication information (of claim 1) with tables of a user account database that includes account IDs (as disclosed in Guthrie, column 5, lines 35-42). In addition to the reasons mentioned above, information such as account ID would not be transmitted in Guthrie from the server to the client because the client already has this information in order to access the server in the first place. (See step 2 on Figure 4 of Guthrie.) Because of such differences from Guthrie, claim 1 is patentable over Guthrie and therefore should be allowed. Because claim 1 is allowable, its dependent claims are also allowable.

Assignee also respectfully disagrees with other positions in the office action. For example, assignee respectfully disagrees with the rejection of claim 3 that is based upon Guthrie.

Claim 3 recites in combination with its other limitations that the authentication system is configured to receive a seed request. The office action states that this is disclosed by Guthrie at column 7, lines 5-6, which reads, “the client then transmits the response produced by the client SADB calculator to the server.” Even assuming *arguendo* that Guthrie is discussing a seed, this passage from Guthrie (which is discussed within the context of step 5 shown in figure 4 of Guthrie) does not disclose *a request* for a seed as required by claim 3. Rather, as is shown in Figure 4 of Guthrie, this step, labeled as step 5 in the figure, is in fact *a response* to a previous request (i.e., the challenge sent by the server). A response to a request does not disclose an authentication system configured to receive a seed request as required by claim 3. Thus, claim 3 is patentable over Guthrie and should be allowed.

In rejecting the other independent claims, the office action cites Guthrie as disclosing the subject matter recited in claims 30-32. Assignee respectfully disagrees. These claims refer to a request for the authentication information that is stored in an authentication data store. After authentication of the user, the authentication information (that is stored in the data store) is returned to the remote device so that the remote device may access computer resources based upon the returned authentication information. Guthrie does not disclose such limitations. As shown above, Guthrie never discloses that authentication information from an authentication information store is transmitted to a remote device. To stretch Guthrie to do this would go against Guthrie’s express purpose of not transmitting stored authentication information over a network to a remote device. Because Guthrie discloses such a different approach than the respective subject matter in claims 30-32, these claims are allowable and should proceed to issuance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 586-3939